



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Tintoretto

**Citation for published version:**

Vellodi, K 2019, 'Tintoretto: Cosmic Artisan', *Deleuze Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 207-239.  
<https://doi.org/10.3366/dlgs.2019.0353>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.3366/dlgs.2019.0353](https://doi.org/10.3366/dlgs.2019.0353)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

Deleuze Studies

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the accepted version of an article that has been published by Edinburgh University Press in the journal *Deleuze Studies*, Volume 13, Issue 2,  
<https://www.eupublishing.com/doi/abs/10.3366/dlgs.2019.0353>

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## TINTORETTO: COSMIC ARTISAN

### Abstract

The works of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Venetian painter Jacopo Tintoretto (1518-1594) present us with a radicalised idea of the cosmos that challenges both the humanistic centring of the world on man and the hierarchy of divine authority that dominate the artistic traditions to which he is heir. In their place, Tintoretto confronts us with a 'machinic' staging of forces in which man, nature, religious figure and artificial element are integrated within an extended material plane. With this pictorial immanence, Tintoretto presents a 'cosmic materialism' unprecedented in Venetian painting. In this, his work gives provocative expression to Deleuze and Guattari's ontology of the artwork as 'cosmic' construction, and to their conception of the artist as 'cosmic artisan'. Via readings of the art historical reception of Tintoretto's work by the art historian Arnold Hauser (1892-1978), and the artistic reception of Tintoretto's work by Paul Cézanne, I explore this expression, and attend to questions of modernity, temporality, and art history as they are inflected in Deleuze and Guattari's thought.

Keywords:

Cosmic, art, thought, experience, time, modernism

## I. Tintoretto's Cosmos

'monde inconnu, fantastique et pourtant reel'<sup>i</sup>

In his 1551 *Creation of the Animals* (figure 1), the painter Jacopo Tintoretto presents us with a curious idea of cosmogenesis. The figure of God does not assume an elevated position from which he conducts and surveys his earthly creation. Rather he too is in flight, travelling with the birds, fishes, sea, and land, involved in the movement that encompasses them all - a relentless lateral flow that traverses the earth instead of pulling its inhabitants downwards in a natural, gravitational exertion. It is a remarkably irreverent composition. In this strange passage of oddly machinic creatures, creatures engaged not in the specific and definitive movements of their respective species but powered from without by an unorthodox lateral movement of the world, God is no longer a figure of transcendence but part of a race he does not lead.

The submission of even the figures of divine authority to a dynamic play of forces that engulfs all in its wake is a provocation to which we are repeatedly submitted in Tintoretto's works. It is perhaps most striking in the magisterial ceiling paintings of the *Sala Superiore* in the Scuola di San Rocco, the home of some of Tintoretto's most astonishing paintings, and where we find the culmination of his artistic vision in one of the largest cycles of paintings ever produced.<sup>ii</sup>

In *The Brazen Serpent* (1576) (figure 2), Christ is a barely perceptible figure, his diminutive frame overwhelmed by surging forces that take possession of, and cast into disarray the entire composition, whilst figures are hurled through the sky like deranged puppets. In *Moses Striking the Rock* (1577) (figure 3), the oversized figure of God is supported by the rotational forces of a cloud-machine that powers Him like a celestial turbine, whilst Moses is subsumed by the hydraulic forces issuing from powerful jets of water that arc over him. And in *The Miracle of the Manna* (1577) (figure 4), the figure of God is dwarfed by the forces of bodies twisting convulsively in the composition's foreground and the electrical currents of paint that make foliage dance.

These are violent, ungrounded worlds that not only undermine the hieratic status of figures of divinity, but also challenge any clear binary divide between the earthly and the celestial spheres. Tintoretto had already, several years earlier, announced this challenge in *The Last Judgement* (1562) (figure 5) where a swelling expanse of contorted figures overthrows the customary divide of this composition into a lower and an upper half. In place of this distinction, and indeed of any distinctly demarcated territories as such, Tintoretto confronts us with extended zones of indistinction morphing into each other through the vertiginous continuity of a de-territorialised matter.

A new pictorial world is taking expression, governed neither by a subservient relation to a divine order that transcends it, nor humanistically centred on man.

## II. Classical Discipline of Form to Cosmic Play of Forces.

We are not the first to intuit it. Paul Cézanne was astonished by what he called Tintoretto's 'cosmic obsession'.<sup>iii</sup> And the eminent 20<sup>th</sup> century Hungarian art historian Arnold Hauser was fascinated by the cosmic dimension of Tintoretto's works, which he took as an expression of a radical unorthodoxy directed against painting's hegemonic 'classicism' and 'discipline of form'.<sup>iv</sup>

In the tradition of Venetian painting to which Tintoretto is apparently heir, such discipline might be identified with the late works of his influential predecessor Giovanni Bellini (1430-1516). A comparison of Bellini's *St Francis in Ecstasy* (figure 6) with Tintoretto's *Vision of Esekial* (figure 7) allows us to better grasp the sense of Hauser's and Cézanne's intimation.

One of Bellini's most celebrated works, *St Francis* (c.1480) radiates consummate formal balance and order. Placed in the central foreground and flush with the picture plane, the eponymous Saint is harmoniously integrated with his meticulously rendered surrounds. In this enchanting, luminous landscape, forms are sharply delineated and their location in space clearly demarcated. The composition upholds the norms of laterality, rational perspective and the classical, Albertian laws of decorum, balance and propriety that impart to the work its pleasing coherency and formal discipline.<sup>v</sup>

Tintoretto's *Vision of Ezekial* (1578) relinquishes such pictorial strategies. The unhinged figures of Ezekial and God rotate, groundless, at a sharp diagonal to each other, their relations to their surrounds disjunct, irrational. Lateral logic

and rational perspective are abandoned. The formal boundaries of objects are subverted by the violent play of forces to which they are subject in an intensity of vision that departs from the serene contemplation of Bellini's protagonist.

Tintoretto was certainly not the first artist to challenge Bellini's classicism. The obscuring of formal clarity by atmospheric effects, in a technique known as *sfumato*, inaugurated by Giorgione and taken up and intensified by a notable sequence of Venetian painters, reaching a point of resolution in Titian's late works. However even in his final works, including his renowned *Pietà* (1575) (figure 8), Titian retains the discipline of form which he begins to subvert. The juxtaposition of the *Pietà* with the three paintings of the miracles of Saint Mark that hang opposite it in Venice's Gallerie dell'Accademia reveals the distance between the two contemporaries. For all its spectralisation of form, and the surprising, violent movement of Mary Magdalene towards the plane, the *Pietà*'s retention of symmetry, of a classical architectural feature as a backdrop, and the balanced triangular arrangement of the main figures upholds a classicist logic.

Tintoretto's *St Mark* works (figure 9) painted in the mid 1560's, reveal another preoccupation. Figures writhe and contort in inhuman poses, waters swell in stormy rages, and skies swirl with imminent storms in compositions governed by diagonals, spirals and arcs cast along destabilised axis. Here, the forces of a miraculous event overthrows formal discipline; violence and dynamism displace aristocratic poise; supernatural intensity unhinge organic sensualism. Whereas pictorial space in Bellini's *St Francis* and Titian's *Pieta* is contained within the

picture frame, and containing insofar as space encloses form, the 'cosmic range', and 'cosmic space' of Tintoretto's works 'bursts the bonds' of this classical space governed by containment.<sup>vi</sup> In the evaluation of such works, as the 17thc Venetian writer Marco Boschini had noted, 'measurement and form no longer help.'<sup>vii</sup> It is not simply a question of obscuring given forms. A more essential displacement is occurring.

Returning to San Rocco, let us accompany Hauser in his passage into *The Flight into Egypt* (figure 10). Forced straining for the infinite, brazen renunciation of the domestic warmth and pleasing familiarity of forests, glades and streams in favour – and what curious favour! – of enervated vegetation and turbulent skies. A foreboding intensity haunts even the moment of the Holy Family's 'rest'. But there can be no rest in such 'macrocosmic' and 'primeval' dramas, where in vain do we look for 'historical definition' and 'human reference'.<sup>viii</sup> Rather, here, 'biblical content [...] is increasingly transformed into [...] cosmography' and 'Nature itself, with its magical strangeness, has nothing to do with the intimate poetry of Venetian landscape painting, or the human proportions of earlier landscape painting in general'.<sup>ix</sup>

From Giovanni Bellini and Carpaccio to Cima, from Giorgione to Titian, Venetian painting had presented to us a lyrical treatment of landscape as the harmonious backdrop to human, mythic and divine activity. In Bellini's *St Francis*, nature is fully integrated into the narrational content, as a single celestial light source infuses its rays into rock, building and Saint alike. But Tintoretto gives to us a ruffled nature of storms and gales, of vegetation

possessed by electrical currents, a dramatised nature illuminated not by the diffuse light of day but by the extremised light of an eternal dusk. Enfolding artifice within it, this extended nature expresses a cosmic vision that renounces the world given to our senses, and through which things are, as Max Dvořák - Hauser's teacher, and upon whose reading of Tintoretto Hauser shapes his own - tells us, newly portrayed 'not as they appear to the conventional mind'.<sup>x</sup> In *Moses Striking the Rock* even God himself 'becomes a moving heavenly body, a whirling wheel of fire in the mechanism of the universe'. In these 'staged' worlds that are no longer clearly based on the Christian gospel, 'the prophets and Saints, and the God that gather are, as it were, all partners fellow-actors, not producers of the play' to effect a synthesis, 'unparalleled' in Tintoretto's time, of 'the real and the unreal, the natural and unnatural, the worldly and the other -worldly'.<sup>xi</sup>

### III. A Machine Aesthetic

This unparalleled synthesis is, as Hauser intimates, produced through a new practice of painting as staging. Far from basing his work in the observation of life, in the world as it is given to senses, and producing compositions through what Heinrich Wölfflin called pieces 'cut out haphazard from the visible world', Tintoretto begins the process of painting with a staging that betrays no immediate relation to a given and observed nature, and which instead consists in the artificial construction of relations.<sup>xii</sup> His invention of a miniature box made of card and wood, with windows cut out of it through which light would be shone to produce exaggerated effects and in which small figures of wax and



clay would be placed and hung by threads from the ceilings gives rise to what might be called a 'machinic aesthetic'.<sup>xiii</sup>

Painting begins with a little machine.

A construction of relations of forces – forces of illumination, angle, direction, proportion - displaces the observation of empirical forms, producing the destabilising effect that would lure Cézanne centuries later. The San Rocco ceiling paintings reveals this procedure at work. In these paintings, we find figures occupying a vertiginous and exaggerated space, with no natural opening. Pictorial elements, disconnected and apparently groundless, seem to have been observed from different points of view simultaneously – an effect no doubt made possible by the presence of a little box that could be easily manipulated and observed from many angles. Through the box, Tintoretto can explode the boundaries of a defined space, and augment space in a continual construction. Adding a window here, removing a wall here, adding a new figure, or shining a different light source from a new angle – the compositional combinations are endless, and quickly achieved.

This method of staging functions as the source of Tintoretto's disruption of the traditions he inherits. It is a point that demands emphasis. For ever since his first biographer, Carlo Ridolfi, claimed (in 1642) that he sought to synthesise the *colorito* of Titian with the *disegno* of Michelangelo, art history has read Tintoretto as the heir of these hitherto competing traditions. But the staged machinery of Tintoretto's practice unmoors this inheritance. In place of Titian's use of colour as 'the primary building blocks in our conception of form [...]

arising directly from the artist's perceptual experience of nature'<sup>xiv</sup>, Tintoretto presents us with an un- or hyper-real use of colour, a colorism conjuring a transfigured nature that has 'nothing in common with what we see'. In the words of one early 20<sup>th</sup> century commentator, the character of these works is 'expressive rather than realistic', mobilising an expressionism 'even more vital than that of form'.<sup>xv</sup>

In the ceiling panels of the *Sala Superiore*, the organic pictorialism of a natural perception has been displaced by electric silvery hues streaking across sharp tonal contrasts, detached from any natural or rational fall of light. The coloured material of paint vibrates in blocks or dances in daubs detached from particular figurative referents. Thus, in the *Miracle of the Manna* the brick red of a figure's drapery returns in an earthenware pot, and the celestial silvers of the clouds are found again in the hairs of a dog's coat. In the work's lower half, coloured blocks and the upturned frontal plane seem to be in joint collusion against the figures that vainly strive to ground themselves on their precipitously rotating platform. Here there is no natural vista, no softened horizon stretching as far as the eye can see. Instead, the wild dancing of fleshless figures in a space with no natural parameters.

Confronted by such works it is by no means clear that Tintoretto subverts the Venetian tradition in order to assume in its place, as is often contended in the scholarship, the Florentine. In place of Michelangelo's treatment of the human figure as ideal and central form, and as *piccolo mondo*,<sup>xvi</sup> we are given deformed, contorted, exploded figures, products of a machinic genesis of a

staging method, hyper-pliable figures that are interconnected with, rather than surveyors of, the myriad of pictorial elements (mineral, vegetal, animal, synthetic) with which they are conflated. In Tintoretto's numerous studies 'after' Michelangelo the smooth contours of Michelangelo's forms are exploded by eccentric, agitated marks, and this continuity of the figure with painter matter is seen in the many clusters of spectral figures that populate Tintoretto's late works. In *The Miracle of the Manna*, we see them in the mid to far background – silvery figures, blending with the falling manna. Even the figure of God is insubstantial, an assemblage of material traits rather than a commanding figurative form.

#### IV. The Historian's Reception.

Hauser approaches Tintoretto's innovations through the lens of the historical shift from the humanistic microcosmic idea to the macrocosmic conception of later 16<sup>th</sup> century thinkers such as Giordano Bruno. From the microcosmic *piccolo mondo*, in which 'the intelligible order of the universe – the cosmos – is literally and exactly reflected in man', we move to a macrocosmic conception in which the Copernican system (and we note that Tintoretto is painting in the years just after Copernicus publishes his revolutionary text in 1543) is expanded to infinity and the human mind is made a bearer of the forces that traverse it, such that 'the self becomes the source of the idea of the absolute, the link with the infinite, the eternal and the all.'<sup>xvii</sup> Hauser is not dissociating Tintoretto from the idea - dominant in medieval theology, classical metaphysics and strands of Renaissance Neoplatonist philosophy - of the universe as a hierarchic

order with man occupying the highest place, grounded in a general providence that rules over the destiny of man and world to instead align him with the revolutionary ideas of the painter's esteemed contemporary Copernicus.<sup>xviii</sup> He is not claiming that Tintoretto's works reflect Copernicus' new heliocentric conception of the cosmos, according to which man is now vertiginously placed in an infinite space rotating around a stationary Sun - a space in which, as Ernst Cassirer memorably put it, 'his being seems to be a single and vanishing point'.<sup>xix</sup> Faced by the upturned worlds of the San Rocco paintings it is certainly not ludicrous to imagine an interpretation that sees in Tintoretto's disjunctive, precipitous, groundless spaces a correspondence of a new philosophical uncertainty of man's place in the cosmos, as famously voiced by Pascal.<sup>xx</sup> But Hauser doesn't think so. And his feeling is supported by the paintings. For in them we see that Tintoretto has *not* lost his bearings in an infinite space. Even in the disorientating and restless late works at San Rocco, such as *Moses Striking the Rock* and the *Miracle of the Manna*, the ground has not entirely disappeared (as it would do by the time we arrive at Tiepolo two centuries later), and the figures, though mobile and plastic, are still firm and domineering. Man is still central – but his nature has been irremediably altered. However apparently irrational, these compositions retain resolve and solidity.

Cassirer, whose reading is very close to Hauser's, reminds us that the modern philosophy of the 16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries, including that of Montaigne and Bruno, converts the 'apparent curse of the Copernican cosmology into a blessing'. Namely, man can once again be empowered in embracing the infinite through

the limitless powers of his intellect. For Montaigne, 'man alone is able to value things according to their true estimate and grandeur', through the powers of his reason, whilst Bruno extends the Copernican hypothesis to postulating an infinite universe. He presents a concept of positive infinity where for the first time the infinite no longer means what goes beyond the bounds of human reason, but rather pertains to 'the immeasurable and inexhaustible abundance of reality and the unrestricted power of the human intellect.'<sup>xxi</sup> Bruno underscores Copernicus's discovery of the infinite universe as a liberation of space as 'the free medium of movement, extending unhindered beyond every finite border and in all directions', and liberates the Ego as a constant striving and action, a 'drive to ascend and the power of upward movement'.<sup>xxii</sup>

Tintoretto certainly seems to share affinities with Bruno's idea of transcendent immanence, whereby the powers of infinite conception within a finite mind render man immanent to the infinite forces of the cosmos<sup>xxiii</sup>. The sense of the infinite as dynamic, extended and configurable certainly seems to find potent expression in Tintoretto's expanded, multi-dimensional spaces. The upward thrusts we encounter in works such as the *Last Judgment* anticipate Bruno's notions of spiritual ascension (Bruno's works were first published in the 1580's, the decade before Tintoretto's death), whilst the works of the 1580's onwards, such as *The Last Supper* in San Giorgio Maggiore (1592) (figure 11), reveal an intensification of a mysterious space.

In this painting, one of Tintoretto's last, the action is set within a completely enclosed box with no openings. There are no windows in this particular stage-

set. The sole source of light is a lamp whose emissions cast a mysterious haze of luminosity over the scene – a material haze, since the rays of light are painted as material articulations of paint. These fiery, dynamic articulations morph into an incredible cluster of insubstantial aerial beings, beings with no flesh. Clustered around the light source, they assume luminous bodies, but as they float away from the lamp, they become translucent. These celestial beings, which would usually descend from a depicted or implicated celestial abode, here emanate from an artificial source, a stage prop. It is a strange, anarchic invention, revealing the artificial logic that governs the machinic celestuality Tintoretto newly constructs through his stage method. In place of a depicted division between body and spirit, between the terrestrial and the celestial, there is a material becoming of the one into the other through a light that is at once sourced from an ‘earthly’ object yet which gives rise to celestial beings. Needless to say, this eccentric play of artificial-cosmic effects overwhelms the *story* of *The Last Supper*.

One might speculate at the presence of Bruno’s ideas in the way in which the sense of the infinite is brought into a finite room. However, Tintoretto’s curious undermining of the figure of man through deformation, exaggeration, and the lack of distinguishing facial features do not portray him as abundantly empowered, but simply one element of a plane on which animal, vegetal, and mineral mix and collide. In Tintoretto’s works, man’s powers are not just expanded; they are superseded by the forces that traverse him. In *The Last Supper*, it is not the men, but the light – domestic yet celestial – that is the

source of expanding powers. This would seem to deviate from Bruno's still humanist leanings. How can we say, of figures curling and collapsing, with faces in shadow, and as though propelled by forces outside themselves, that we are witnessing the upwards striving of the human mind? There is indubitably a striving here, but, mechanised and puppet-like, it no longer clearly assumes anthropological coordinates.

Thus, whilst Tintoretto's work certainly shares traits with the intellectual outlooks of his time, and we would need to explore more carefully in what ways if any the paintings after 1580 (that is, after the publication of Bruno's works) indicate a new sense of cosmology, it resists any clear correspondence to a defined programme, either one that upholds man's centrality in the cosmos, or one that attempts to salvage man's self-convictions in the face of the uncertainty brought on by his confrontation with the infinite.

The implication of Hauser's observations is that Tintoretto's works function as transition, already beyond classicism whilst not yet Baroque (in so far as we have not yet arrived at the conception of space as infinite). Tintoretto's machinism departs from the classical finitude that both Titian and Michelangelo retain, but not for the baroque limitlessness which we will later encounter for example in the airy, expansive worlds of Rubens, Tiepolo and Piazzetta - where the anticlassical traits of groundlessness, the diagonal, and uncontained, limitless space have become a recognisable and shared style. Rather, Tintoretto's practice signals a moment of experimental and unresolved anti-classicism that does not yet represent anything. His machines do not yet

mean anything: they merely function, to break down existing preconceptions and norms, and produce something else.

But Hauser wants Tintoretto's innovations to mean something, and to mean something with respect to their time. And so, perhaps not unsurprisingly, he does go on to characterise them as part of the mannerist counter-revolution. Not yet baroque, Tintoretto is less contentiously placed within the restless phase that preceded it. Anti-classicism is concentrated in the stylistic efforts of a group of contemporaries, all responding to the 'crisis' of the High Renaissance, and its essentially unstable and dynamic character. Deformation, exaggeration, affectation, the breaking up of regularity and harmony, lined with a vigorous dose of the bizarre, lead to 'an abandonment of classical forms' based entirely on the art of the preceding epoch. Whilst it is only 'in our time', Hauser contends, in the light of late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century innovations, that we can perceive and evaluate mannerism as a style, he nevertheless interprets mannerism as 'a purely historical category' that characterises an aesthetic phenomenon utterly of its time, complete with a set of definitive traits shared by a group of contemporary artists.<sup>xxiv</sup> Tintoretto may be 'unparalleled' in his time, but he is definitively of it.

#### **V. Artistic Reception: Cosmic Obsession beyond Historical Function.**

Yet it is precisely the effects of Tintoretto's works, which traverses the representation of religious sentiment and story, that several centuries later intrigues Cézanne. He asks Joachim Gasquet,



‘When you were in Venice, did you see that gigantic Tintoretto in which earth and sea on a painted globe hang overhead, with its shifting horizon, its depth, its watery distances, and flying bodies, and this vast round thing, this globe, this planet flung headlong, falling, rolling in outer space? In that period! It was a prophecy for ours. He already had this cosmic obsession we’re bitten with.’<sup>xxv</sup>

For Cézanne, Tintoretto is a figure who foretells the future in his own time. In his obsession with a decentred, ungrounded and extended play of forces and bodies expanded beyond human coordinates, Tintoretto leaps out from his own time into the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Cézanne seemingly has no interest in a historical figure: it is for his function for the present that he looks to the painter with the cosmic obsession. As he continues, ‘I am certain that while he was painting [Tintoretto] didn’t think about anything but [...] painting well. But painting well means that, in spite of yourself, you speak for your age in terms that register its most advanced awareness.’<sup>xxvi</sup> We might ask ourselves what might happen were we to follow these impulses of an artist who looks to history as a producer and not as a scholar, who experiences the past for the sake of a present production. Cézanne’s pragmatic experience of the past – an experience mediated by the practical concerns of painting in the present – indicates the pertinence of an approach that loosens the inscription (one that the historian Hauser retains) of Tintoretto within his historical context.

We may find a conceptual framework adequate to this expression of the excess of experience over contextualist intelligibility in the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari. For them, Tintoretto (one of a handful of pre 19<sup>th</sup> century artistic

figures who recurs in their work) is definitively not a 'historical' painter. He is, rather, the keeper of painting's 'eternal object': to capture forces.<sup>xxvii</sup> Tintoretto 'decodes the flows of Venetian painting', breaking through its signifiers, through the aesthetic formations 'that are characterised by goals, schools and periods' with the unleashed desire of the experiment.<sup>xxviii</sup> In this way, Deleuze and Guattari continue where Hauser, the historian, leaves off. Where Hauser ultimately concludes his assessment of his subject with the attribution of historical (that is, contextualist) sense, Deleuze and Guattari theorise the extraction from the past of a currency against historical value, in the way in which Cézanne's intuitions invite us to grasp. Their method is artistic, not historical.

#### **VI. Cosmic Materialism: Deleuze and Guattari.**

Within the long and complex history of the problematisation of man's relation to the cosmos Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy assumes a singular place. Whilst inheriting the philosophical problem of attending to the capture of the infinite in thought, and rejecting any notion of transcendent design as given by theological force, evolutionary nature or innate human capacity, Deleuze and Guattari's 'cosmos' designates an open system based on the relations and interactions of impersonal forces in *this* world.<sup>xxix</sup> The philosophical question is no longer the investigation of the supra-terrestrial beyond our earth, but the supra-terrestrial within our world; how we are to think the strangeness within our experience of this world, that 'transcendental' element that is not given in it.<sup>xxx</sup> What Deleuze and Guattari calls the cosmos is not already given, but is to

be produced through the 'deterritorialisation' of given and lived states of affairs. Such immanent cosmogenesis within our world, but not 'of' our world affirms the ineluctable and violent necessity of an event that happens to thought, the event that restores the infinite within the borders of man's finite, organic limitations. Thus thinking, Deleuze and Guattari tell us, 'takes place in the relationship of territory and earth [...] The earth constantly carries out a movement of deterritorialisation on the spot, by which it goes beyond any territory'.<sup>xxxi</sup> This may sound suspiciously close to Bruno's pantheism. However, for Deleuze and Guattari thinking is not the possession of a human subject, but an impersonal 'thought-nature'. This is an immanent, but non-anthropological, cosmology. The exteriorised difference between thought as the activity of a subject and nature as that which is given to the thinking subject is overcome with a new model of ontogenesis as cosmogenesis. Both thought (newly understood not as the natural activity of the human subject, but an impersonal genesis of Ideas) and Nature (newly understood not as a given empirical state of affairs but as a constructed reality) are newly grasped as the reciprocally constructed products of a transcendental synthesis of forces – 'where 'transcendental' does not pertain to objects outside the world but, on the contrary, the imperceptible difference within the world. This imperceptible element is the pure being of the sensible, insensible to the 'ordinary' experience in which the faculties are united in a common sense (through which, in Kantian terms, the sensible becomes representable). Pure *sensibilia* can only be experienced under exceptional conditions - conditions which the work of art can supply.

This task is a modern one. Echoing Cézanne, Deleuze and Guattari write: ‘if there is a modern age, it is, of course, the age of the cosmic.’<sup>xxxii</sup> This is an acknowledgement, borrowing the terms of Paul Virilio, of the augmented relation to the earth and the people in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century. Through the forces of globalisation, and their dissemination through industry, mass media, mechanical reproduction and digital technology, the earth has reached ‘its most deterritorialized.’ It is now ‘not only a point in a galaxy, but one galaxy among others’. At the same time, the people is ‘at its most molecularized: a molecular population’ that has lost its sense of the local and overcome by the mass.<sup>xxxiii</sup> As ‘the human essence of nature and the natural essence of man [have] become one within nature in the form of production or industry’, the ‘distinction between nature and artifice is becoming blurred’, giving rise to an *inorganic* nature intensively identified with industry as ‘production of man and by man’. Faced by these circumstances, we need a new philosophy of Nature. Against the mechanisation of the present, we need a constructivist philosophy of a machinic Nature.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Art aids in this project. Art is ‘not the privilege of human beings’<sup>xxxv</sup>. And the modern artist can create ‘new worlds’ and ‘new peoples’. Art’s work assumes the task of immanently restoring the infinite from the finite by creating sensations that transcend, and survive, the finite quality of material.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Abandoning reference to transcendental structures of symbolic and figurative codes, the modern work of art can engage in a working of matter that firstly ‘molecularises’ it, and secondly makes it ‘ascend’ into the infinite domain of

sensations ‘where all disparate and heterogeneous elements are convoked’.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

Thus, the composer Oliver Messiaen captures the ‘stars, atoms and birds in the same being of sensation’.<sup>xxxviii</sup> As a ‘chaosmos’ neither foreseen nor preconceived – a cosmos constructed from the chaos of deterritorialised material - art gives material and sensorial expression to the problem of thought as ‘infinite movement beyond the reference points of subject and object.

Deleuze and Guattari thus imparts to the idea of art’s work as world-forming a singular sense – as an impersonal, material construction in the sensible. Whilst the idea of art as the privileged ontological agent of world-formation indicates a post-Heideggerian and post-phenomenological impetus - one apparently reinforced by the ostensible privileging (in *Francis Bacon, Logic of Sensation*) of painting as the being of sensation – Deleuze and Guattari conceive of art (all arts, painting included) as the privileged ontological agent, not of world-formation or unconcealment, but of an unworldly cosmogenesis. It is not as a revelation of the world of the shoe-wearing peasant that a painting of shoes concerns Deleuze and Guattari. Rather painting is understood as the expression of forces ‘outside’ man’s existential or lived horizon – a departure that Francois Millet’s declaration (which will be taken up by Cézanne) that ‘what counts in painting is not...what a peasant is carrying, whether it is a sacred object or a sack of potatoes, but its exact weight’, is used to announce.<sup>xxxix</sup> Deleuze and Guattari reject the phenomenological intertwining of the being of sensation, as flesh, with the world: ‘the being of sensation is not the flesh but the compound of nonhuman forces of the cosmos’.<sup>xl</sup> For Merleau-Ponty, painting’s flesh gives

to us the being of sensation as the 'unity or reversibility of feeling and felt', as the embodiment of an originary, shared world that traverses the lived but remains bound to the perceptual structures of the human. But art (and not just painting) is for Deleuze and Guattari the being of sensation in its autonomy from the all-too human activities of perception and affection. To underscore this they claim that painting 'starts not with the flesh but with the house'.<sup>xli</sup> A house is a construct, a finite junction of planes that imparts to sensation the power to stand on its own. In addition to the flesh of painting that designates the regime of colour and the house that designates the architecture of planes, painting produces the third element of the cosmos, where the house is deframed and opens onto the field of colour [*l'aplat*] of infinite forces.<sup>xlii</sup>

In constructing such work, or more specifically, this 'refrain', the modern artist is no longer a human subject or even an artist, but a 'cosmic artisan': 'To be an artisan and no longer an artist, creator, or founder, is the only way to become cosmic, to leave the milieus and the earth behind.'<sup>xliii</sup> Whilst the artist is a figure separated in his predetermined, recognised, and historically inscribed activities from sensible and material flows, and situated within the 'molar' aesthetic regime (the structured, organised, historical, signifying level of artistic production), the artisan is an impersonal agent, immanently inscribed in the material that he 'follows' prior to any capture by regimes. But by 'artisan', Deleuze and Guattari do not indicate the traditional, pre 20<sup>th</sup> century image of the artisan as craftsman, mechanically and laboriously applying techniques to his material. The cosmic artisan is not a 'worker'. He is a figure whose work is

Commented [AaCV1]: What is molar?

situated beyond the traditional distinctions between artisan and artist. He is not a historical category of producer, but an itinerant and ambulant agency in becoming that eludes definition or codification.<sup>xliv</sup>

In this regard, the anecdote of Tintoretto's self-apprenticeship is not insignificant. Banished from the studio of Titian when the older master noted his talent, Tintoretto was, we are told, forced to train himself.<sup>xlv</sup> Denied of an inherited artistic identity and given models, he is forced to think and affirms his difference. His staging machine is not an already established technique handed down to him, but an experiment that he shares neither with his predecessors nor his contemporaries. It is a machine of sensation, decentred with respect to the preformed structures and coordinates of the world given to his senses.<sup>xlvi</sup>

His unnatural, uninhabitable 'little houses' deframe the form of painting, placing painting in its genetic mode outside its historically recognised form as the material manipulation of paint on canvas. The notion of the artisan acquires another important sense in the context of Tintoretto's Venice, where unlike her liberal neighbour Florence, the painter's profession was still (and up until the late 17<sup>th</sup> century)<sup>xlvii</sup> governed and regulated by the agencies of the State-controlled guild - the *Arte dei Depentori*, established in 1271. Tintoretto – whose very name (meaning 'little dyer') indicates his affiliation for the artisanal identity – himself worked as a *cassone* panel painter in his early years before becoming a *figurer*, a painter of figures.<sup>xlviii</sup> And yet, in his independence of spirit and painterly style, and even in the self-conscious assumption of the name of 'dyer', Tintoretto expresses tensions between the liberated artist and

the bound craftsman. The complexity of his compositions and effects, and the often erudite references that populate his paintings contradict the recognised status of an artisan.<sup>xlix</sup>

## VII. Cosmic Modernism: Tintoretto-Cézanne.

‘If there is a modern age, it is, of course, the age of the cosmic.’<sup>i</sup>

Thought as cosmic construction rather than worldly reflection, reproduction or communication; thought that constitutes a possibility of thinking without referring to a position already within the world from which to think it, and without yet defining a thinker capable of it and able to say ‘I’; thought that invests the unthinkable and chaotic forces of an immaterial, nonformal and energetic Cosmos, is said by Deleuze and Guattari to characterise its modern image.<sup>li</sup>

What is meant by ‘modern’ here is not evident. On the one hand, as we have seen, it seems to refer to a chronologically inscribed period – the image of thought as one that characterises philosophical, scientific and artistic production from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century to the present in which Deleuze and Guattari are writing. On the other hand, they also present us with a sense of the modern as bearing no essential relation to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and no essential form(s). In this latter sense, a modern image of thought recurs throughout history in thought’s ongoing confrontation with the ‘outside’ beyond the transcendent determinants (‘morality’, ‘reason’, ‘truth’) that



ground it prior to its activity and which it inherits from a history that both limits and conditions it.<sup>lii</sup>

On the back of this apparent tension, we may grasp Deleuze and Guattari's approach as one of reactivating the critical potential of past systems of thought against, and *therefore* for, the present: against the present as a recognisable and representable state, and for the present as a critical transformation of its given state. A modern practice of philosophy entails an experience of the history of philosophy in its most un-timely reaches, an embrace of the movements of the infinite in systems of thought that in turn may be critically activated against the ever-present spectre of representation. For 'it behooves philosophy not to be modern at any cost, no more than to be nontemporal, but to extract from modernity something that Nietzsche designated as the untimely, which pertains to modernity, but which must also be turned against it – in favour, I hope, of a time, and a reality yet to come'.<sup>liii</sup>

This apparent dichotomy reappears in the characterisation of art. Whilst it is the 'modern' (20<sup>th</sup> century) work of art, in its experimental liberation of matter and force from the form of representation, that embarks on a cosmogenetic escape from the human-centred world, the capture of forces has been the aim of art *for all time* even if it had been concealed under other aims and objects<sup>liv</sup>. It is art's eternal imperative to free the molecular and the cosmic from its molar trappings. Such liberation was already found in Classicism and Romanticism. However, in the works of Classicism and Romanticism, these forces were not grasped directly in themselves but 'reflected in relations between matter and

form'. So, the classical artist organises (superimposes form onto) the chaos of matter, and the Romantic artist 'no longer confronts the gaping of chaos but the [territorial] pull of the Ground (Fond).<sup>lv</sup> And yet, as an eternal imperative, the modern does not designate a period that 'comes after' the Romantic, and Classical. It is not a question of three ages in a linear evolution.<sup>lvi</sup> Rather, 'everything we attribute to an age was already present in the preceding age', even if it was concealed in the latter by 'different perceptual conditions' - the conditions under which man perceives, reflects upon and represents his productions. The 'modern' age, of course, is no less immune to such re-presentation of its experiments than the age of classicism. Thus in *Francis Bacon. Logic of Sensation*, Deleuze extracts a modern Bacon from modernity's perceptual conditions – the condition of figuration, and the essentialising and transcendental terms of Greenbergian modernist painting (medium-specificity, abstraction, opticality). He releases Bacon from the modernism that sees the return to abstractions, origins, eternal values and universals. Bacon is not understood as a representative of his times, but as signalling a path for painting's future.

In fact, the re-presentation of forces within the matter-form relation may be said to characterise the territorialising movement of history, in so far as 'what history grasps in an event is the way it's actualised in particular circumstances'<sup>lvii</sup> - and what is actualised, or territorialised in particular circumstances and under particular perceptual conditions is what *can* be actualised as perceptual and re-presentable. History is thus here understood as

the history of perception.<sup>lviii</sup> Whilst the becoming of thought is 'beyond the scope of history' : '[t]here is a becoming of thought which passes through historical formations [...] but which does not resemble them. Thinking must come from the outside of thought, and yet at the same time be engendered from within – beneath the strata and beyond them.'<sup>lix</sup>

Speaking chronologically, Tintoretto might be understood as a classical artist, an artist working at a time chronologically before the 'postromantic turning point' when the form-matter relation is replaced by 'forces, densities, intensities'<sup>lx</sup>. History, as the history of perception, underscores this inscription. It is not Tintoretto in his destruction of organic and human coordinates, irreverently challenging divine hierarchy, that his contemporaries recognise and respond to, or that the historian, keen to situate the artist in his time, articulates, but Tintoretto as an artist intelligible (or not) according to the recognisable characteristics of the artist's endeavour in his time – those aspects of his work that *can be* perceived. Thus, what Giorgio Vasari notes of *the Last Judgment* is the artist's neglect of 'correct and well-ordered drawing' rather than the displacement of the binary organisation of the celestial and the terrestrial. He evaluates the artist who confounds him through the established terms of the time.<sup>lxi</sup> Similarly, the notorious satirist Pietro Aretino praises Tintoretto's *Miracle of the Slave* for its drawing, its lifelike colour and its realism, making no mention of the work's most astonishing feature – the contorted figure of the Saint hurtling through the air. Through such reception, Tintoretto's 'decoding' of painting is reintroduced into 'a properly pictorial

axiomatic that chokes off the escapes'<sup>lxii</sup>, reintegrating novelty into a code that will be copied by a succession of followers.

But beneath the classical demands of his age – the formal discipline of narrative, figuration, representation – and concealed by the perceptual conditions of his historical time that reflect its becoming within the relations of matter-form upon which organic perception is premised - we have a modern Tintoretto, contemporary with Cézanne, contemporary with Bacon. This Tintoretto is not simply Hauser's mannerist reactionary, who anticipates the cultural conditions of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and in turn can be newly perceived through these, whilst being predicated on the preceding epoch. In fact, it may be the case that Tintoretto's work acts as the untimely reminder of modernity's aims against its actual conditions - to create a 'new world'. In this case, might not the historian's most urgent task be to excavate this virtual modernity from the casing that seals it within the stultifying framework of historical intelligibility?

The eternal and untimely object of painting to paint forces will return in the practice of Cézanne. The painter for whom 'rocks begin to exist uniquely through the forces of folding they harness'<sup>lxiii</sup> responds to Tintoretto's works for its cosmic ambition. It is Cézanne's works that supply the conditions for what was buried beneath the classical and anti-classical forms of Tintoretto's work to find expression and be rendered a 'component of a new assemblage'. What is a cosmic ambition? It is not simply a feature of a particular age. It is not the representation of a cosmos. It is not a representation. It is rather the

expression of a becoming, a movement of expansion and molecularization that takes production beyond an actualised historical situation. In this way, Cézanne's look to Tintoretto's cosmic ambition has neither anything to do with the 16<sup>th</sup> century nor with what Cézanne's historical time knows of itself. Return functions against representation; in retaining a relation to the past, painting ensures its critical distance from the living present that it can then transform into a 'new assemblage'.

### **VII *The Feast at Cana and The Orgy***

In Cézanne's *Feast (The Orgy)* 1866/68 (figure 13) we find an example of this. Tintoretto's *Feast at Cana* (1561) (fig. 14) returns in Cézanne's deformed composition. In the latter, the displacement of the religious *historia* and its narrational regime already at work in Tintoretto – specifically in the undermining of the position of Christ, who is here a tiny figure placed at the end of the long, receding table – is exaggerated.<sup>lxiv</sup> Cézanne affirms a Tintoretto remote from the contextual problems of his time – the issue of Tintoretto's relation to his historical circumstances couldn't interest him less. He overthrows the static being of a story. We might note that Cézanne makes no reference to the story of *The Triumph of Venice* (1584), the work to which he is most probably referring in his remark to Gasquet about Tintoretto's cosmic obsession. Did we have to wait for Cézanne to experience Tintoretto's 'cold' subversion of the 16th century convention of the religious *historia*, the going 'beyond the subject' for which Cézanne confessed his admiration?<sup>lxv</sup> The excessiveness of Tintoretto's compositions returns here and its sense is announced as frenzied,

unbridled, and unchristian sentiment that has nothing immediately to do with the Christian story.

This involves a re-construction of Tintoretto's method of attaining sensation - a construction of material that takes deformation as a guiding impulse.<sup>lxvi</sup> The formal resemblances between their works (the acutely recessional table, which could have been directly sourced from Tintoretto's *Feast*; the pillars on the left of the work, which could have been sourced from Tintoretto's *Christ Among the Doctors*) are a product of this repetition of method. And indeed this interest in genesis is what Cézanne had indicated in a letter to Emile Bernard: 'Yes, I approve of your admiration for the greatest of Venetians; we revere Tintoretto [...] and when you find [in nature your means of expression], be assured, you will rediscover without effort and in nature the *means* used by the four or five great ones of Venice.'<sup>lxvii</sup> For Maurice Denis, this method involved a new modulated use of colour. Of a fragment of a frieze found in San Rocco (figure 17) - a rosy cluster of apples, which one can today see surreptitiously propped up beneath Tintoretto's imposing *Crucifixion* – Denis writes 'It is all color. One would call it a Cézanne' in its 'effort at chromatism'<sup>lxviii</sup> But this treatment of colour is only one element of the more holistic method of staging that wrests painting from its naturalism. In the *Orgy*, with its lack of demarcation between an interior house and an external nature, we find an expanded nature, where the table opens directly onto expansive sky, with no ground, and no horizon to restore any stability, in which bodies, house (table, pillar, and canopy) and cosmos (expansive blue background) intermingle on a disorganised plane.<sup>lxix</sup>

Whilst the tilting of the plane upwards towards the picture plane and the acute diagonals of the table might have been lifted from *The Feast at Cana*, the generation of a sharp yet continual recession of planes on the diagonal through tonal gradation, as well as the sharp contrasts of scale in *The Fall of Manna* return in Cézanne's later 'planes in colour'<sup>lxx</sup>. The *non-finito* that, for his contemporaries, demanded Tintoretto's pictures be viewed from a distance, and which were seen as a 'veritable mess' from up close, are affirmed in Cézanne's disjunct spaces of 'close vision', by the declaration of a 'need to no longer see the wheat field' that he paints.<sup>lxxi</sup> *The Orgy* signals neither the formulation of a baroque style, nor an 'unrestrained Romanticism'<sup>lxxii</sup>, but a modern constructivism that incorporates the return not of a classical Tintoretto for the forms of his works, nor a baroque Tintoretto of extended forms (both returns that would take place through the regime of resemblance), but a modern Tintoretto.

Tintoretto returns not for the epistemological investigations of the historian - Hauser's reading of Tintoretto's cosmology as representative of and perceptible in accordance with the particular circumstances of its time - but rather for the practical endeavours of the artist, of the figure who is drawn into the work's compound of sensations and becomes with it. In the work of Cézanne, an artist who engages 'a practical selection among differences according to their capacity to produce'<sup>lxxiii</sup>, Tintoretto returns as cosmic artisan.

## Notes

<sup>i</sup> Taine 1869: 391, quoted in Hauser 1965: 221

<sup>ii</sup> In this paper, I will be focusing on the late works of Tintoretto – the works painted after the 1560's onwards - as it is in these works that we see Tintoretto's cosmic obsession most clearly.

<sup>iii</sup> Quoted in Gasquet 1991: 169

<sup>iv</sup> Hauser 1965: 6

<sup>v</sup> Johannes Wilde (1974) remarks on the fact that these compositions are based on geometrical schemas, and refers to the works of this period as classicist. 29

<sup>vi</sup> Hauser 1965: 51. Hauser, 1951: 48-49

<sup>vii</sup> Quoted in Engass and Brown 1970: 52

<sup>viii</sup> Hauser 1965: 51, 228; Hauser 1962: 127.

<sup>ix</sup> Hauser, 1965: 230. Whilst San Rocco is the most comprehensive series of Christian paintings since Giotto's cycle for the Arena Chapel, the paintings are not orthodox in their treatment of the religious feeling. Many are mythical and fantastic in feel, and far from devotional or evangelical. 220-221

<sup>x</sup> Dvořák 1988: 198-199

<sup>xi</sup> Hauser 1965: 221, 227. Hauser 1962: 127

<sup>xii</sup> Wölfflin 1950: 126

<sup>xiii</sup> Ridolfi 1924, 19

<sup>xiv</sup> Steer 1983: 41

<sup>xv</sup> Osmaston, 1915:130

<sup>xvi</sup> See David Summers (1981) on 'the ancient idea that man is a microcosm, a little world as 'one of the representative ideas of the Renaissance, symbolizing, like the image of the Vitruvian man, the centrality of human values for the age.' 292

<sup>xvii</sup> Ibid, 51, 293

<sup>xviii</sup> Cassirer, 1944: 14, speaks of the dominance of this principle in Stoic thought and Christian theology. Renaissance Neo-Platonists who upheld the notion of the microcosmic *piccolo mondo* include Marsilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico. Schmitt and Skinner 1990: 68-69

<sup>xix</sup> Ibid 13-14 For Cassirer, the Copernican system provides the basis for a new anthropology.

<sup>xx</sup> Ibid 14. Pascal's famous statement: '[I feel] engulfed in the infinite immensity of spaces whereof I know nothing, and which know nothing of me, I am terrified. The eternal silence of these infinite spaces frightens me'. Hauser 1965: 230. 'The space into which the beholder is transported is boundless and immeasurable, but is not 'infinite', does not spell the silence eternal of Pascal or the dehumanised void of the metaphysics of his century. It seems to be on a scale beyond appraisal, but remains finite, does not lose itself in the spaceless and the supersensual.'

<sup>xxi</sup> Ibid 15. For the development of Bruno's cosmology see Schmitt and Skinner 1990: 246

<sup>xxii</sup> Cassirer 2000: 97, 122, 187

<sup>xxiii</sup> Jonathan Goldberg (2009) picks up on the resonance between Bruno and Tintoretto. 19

<sup>xxiv</sup> Hauser 1965: 3; 1962: 88-92. Hauser reads Mannerism as the development of the inherent instability of the High Renaissance, arguing that its classicism was 'more an ideal and a fiction than a reality' and that 'a state of constant social composure has never been reached again since the Middle Ages'. For a critique of Hauser's interpretation see Nichols, 2015: 33.

<sup>xxv</sup> Gasquet 1991: 169. The work to which Cezanne is referring is probably *The Triumph of Venice*, painted in 1584 for Venice's Ducal Palace.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Ibid

<sup>xxvii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 182

<sup>xxviii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003b: 369

<sup>xxix</sup> On the infinite in thought see Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 21, 38.

<sup>xxx</sup> Alain Beaulieu (2016) supplies a clear reading of this immanent cosmology and its relation to the cosmological tradition.



<sup>xxxi</sup> 'A universe-cosmos is not flesh' Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 180 In 'Eye and Mind', Merleau-Ponty speaks of an originary *koinos kosmos* (shared world) – a notion that Deleuze and Guattari depart from 1993: 128, 142

<sup>xxxii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 242

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari (2003a): 345. Deleuze and Guattari are referring to Paul Virilio's 1975 *L'Insecurite du territoire*. 9

<sup>xxxiv</sup> Deleuze (1995): 155. Cosmos philosophy as a new philosophy of nature also characterises the post-Marxist, anti-Freudian project of schizoanalysis, as introduced in the opening pages of *Anti-Oedipus*: the model of the schizophrenic experience of nature as a process of production, where there is no longer a distinction between man and nature, 'only a process that produces the one within the other and couples the machines together. Producing-machines, desiring-machines everywhere, schizophrenic machines, all of species life: the self and the non-self, outside and inside, no longer have any meaning whatsoever.' The idea of the machine as the agency of a "universal primary production" displaces the capitalistic view of autonomous spheres of production, distribution and consumption. There is, Deleuze and Guattari tell us, 'no such thing as relatively independent spheres or circuits: production is immediately consumption and a recording process without any sort of mediation, and the recording process and consumption directly determine production, though they do so within the production process itself.' 2003b: 2, 4

<sup>xxxv</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 316

<sup>xxxvi</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 197. For further elaboration of the modern cosmic artisan see Zepke, 2005: 174-178

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari 2003a: 327

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 170

<sup>xxxix</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 342-343

<sup>xl</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 183

<sup>xli</sup> Ibid: 177

<sup>xlii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 1994: 180

<sup>xliii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 2003a: 345. By 'refrain' Deleuze and Guattari designate the plane in which forces of chaos, terrestrial forces and cosmic forces converge. 312. 'Not only does art not wait for human beings to begin, but we may ask if art ever appears among human beings, except under artificial and belated conditions.' 320

<sup>xliv</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 2003a: 409 On the distinction of Deleuze and Guattari's notion of cosmic artisan from the historical figure of the artisan see Sjoerd Van Tuinen, 2014: 2

<sup>xlv</sup> Ridolfi 1924: 2. Eric Newton describes this as an anecdote that 'no writer on Tintoretto omits to mention' 1952: 11. He continues: 'what matters in the story is not Titian's motive but the fact that a young man of genius was 'left without a master' in an age when the craft of painting could hardly be absorbed without one'.

<sup>xlvi</sup> 'The cosmogenetic paradigm of production is, in its 'grounding' in sensation, an 'aesthetic' paradigm. 1995: 98-119

<sup>xlvii</sup> Nearly two centuries after the creation of the *Accademia delle Arti del Disegno* in Florence, the *Collegio dei Pittori* was founded in 1682 to announce the separation of the Pittori from the Depentori – that is, the recognition of painting as a liberal art distinct from the mechanical arts. Rosand 1982: 14

<sup>xlviii</sup> Rosand: 1982, 10. The son of Giovanni Battista Robusti, a dyer of silk cloths, Tintoretto's birth-name was Jacopo Robusti. In his assumption of the name 'Tintoretto' he assumed an identity that allied him with the culture of the artisanal workshop. This was in contrast to many of his contemporaries, who took nicknames that concealed their lowly origins. Nichols (2015): 20-23. In contrast to Titian's success with aristocratic patronage, Tintoretto 'chose to stay in mercantile Venice where he ran a conventional family workshop': 'the older artisan identity for the artist continued to offer a viable alternative to the emergent courtly model'. This artisan identity is of crucial importance for Jean Paul Sartre. In emphasising that Tintoretto was 'born among the underlings who endured the weight of a superimposed hierarchy... the son of an artisan' who valued only 'physical effort, manual creation' and who 'takes pride in not working for others', Sartre characterises the painter as an oppressed revolutionary. An interesting line of inquiry would be the distinction of cosmic artisan from the cosmopolitan artist as a figure aligned with and reflective of the lived conditions of his time. Sartre's Tintoretto might be understood as cosmopolitan in this regard, as the expression of the emerging conditions of capitalism. Sartre 1963: 1, 15, 24.

<sup>xlix</sup> Nichols 2015:11

<sup>i</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 342

<sup>ii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 54-55

<sup>lii</sup> Thus Spinoza, 'who knew full well that immanence was only immanent to itself and therefore that it was a plane traversed by movements of the infinite' is more modern than Kant, who betrays the immanent critique he announces (the critique of reason by reason itself) by failing to account for the genesis of reason itself and therefore instituting reason as a transcendent to the critique it enacts.

<sup>liii</sup> Deleuze 2004: 302

<sup>liv</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003b: 371

<sup>lv</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 338-339

<sup>lvi</sup> *Ibid*: 346

<sup>lvii</sup> Deleuze 1995: 170

<sup>lviii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 1980a: 346-347

<sup>lix</sup> Deleuze 2006: 41, 253

<sup>lx</sup> *Ibid*: 343

<sup>lxi</sup> Quoted in Lepschy, pp21-24

<sup>lxii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 2003b: 369

<sup>lxiii</sup> Deleuze and Guattari, 2003a: 343

<sup>lxiv</sup> As Theodore Reff writes, whilst the work has been described as a depiction of Belshazzar's Feast, 'the numerous preliminary studies for *L'Orgie* show him searching for expressive forms or groupings without a clearly established scene in mind.' 1963: 15.

<sup>lxv</sup> 'Look how cold their religious painting is. Tintoretto constantly goes beyond his subjects and pleases himself.... There's a painting for you.... One of the real pagans.' In Gasquet 1991: 156

<sup>lxvi</sup> Maurice Denis uses a similar expression for Cézanne: he 'deforms his design [...] by the necessity for expression.' 'What astonishes us most in Cézanne's work is certainly his search for form, or, to be exact, deformation.' 1910: 276 It is worth also comparing here Cézanne's 1895 study after a Michelangelo sculpture with those by Tintoretto – the deformative preoccupation of tonal construction is evident In Gasquet 1991: 127

<sup>lxvii</sup> Letter 23 Dec 1904 in Gasquet, 46

<sup>lxviii</sup> Denis: 279. On the 'chromatic construction', that replaces modelling, of Cézanne's works between 1865 and 1870 see Lionello Venturi, 1978: 62-3.

<sup>lxix</sup> Sara Lichtenstein 1964: 58.

<sup>lxx</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 179. Gasquet: 125.

<sup>lxxi</sup> Deleuze and Guattari 2003a: 493

<sup>lxxii</sup> Gowing 1988: 32

<sup>lxxiii</sup> Deleuze, 1983: 71; 2001: 298

## References

Beaulieu, Alain (2016) 'Introduction to Gilles Deleuze's Cosmological Sensibility' *Philosophy & Cosmology* 2016

(Vol. 16)

Bogue, Ronald (2003) *Deleuze on Music, Painting and the Arts*. Routledge: New York and London.

Cassirer, Ernst (1944) *An Essay on Man. An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*, New Haven,

London: Yale.

Cassirer, Ernst (2000) *The Individual And the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* (trans) Mario Domandi. New

York: Dover

---

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (2003a) *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi, London: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari (2003b) *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, Helen R. Lane, London, New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1994) *What Is Philosophy?* Trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson. London: Verso

Deleuze, Gilles (1995) *Negotiations, 1972-1990*, trans. Martin Joughin, New York: Columbia University Press

Deleuze, Gilles (2001) *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton, London, New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles (2004) *The Logic Of Sense* trans. Mark Lester, Charles Stivale. London, New York: Continuum

Deleuze, Gilles (2006) "Michael Foucault's Main Concepts", in *Two regimes of madness: texts and interviews, 1975-1995*, ed. David Lapoujade, trans. Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina, New York, London: Semiotexte.

Deleuze, Gilles (1983) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, London: Continuum.

Denis, Maurice (1910) 'Cezanne II' *The Burlington Magazine* Vol 16, no. 83, Feb.

Dvorak, Max (1988) 'On El Greco and Mannerism', in *German Essays on Art History*, ed., Gert Schiff. New York: Continuum.

Enggass, Robert and Jonathan Brown (1970) *Spain and Italy 1600-1750*, Italy and Spain 1600-1750 : sources and documents. Englewood Cliffs : Prentice-Hall.

Gasquet, Joachim (1991), *Joachim Gasquet's Cézanne. A Memoir with Conversations* trans. Christopher Pemberton, London: Thames & Hudson.

Guattari, Felix, *Chaosmosis, an ethico-aesthetic paradigm*, trans., Bains, Paul, and Julian Pefanis, Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Goldberg, Jonathan (2009). *The Seeds of Things. Theorizing Sexuality and materiality in Renaissance Representations*. New York: Fordham University Press..

Gowing, Lawrence (1988) *Cezanne: The Early Years 1859-1872*, London : Royal Academy of Arts in association with Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hauser, Arnold (1965) *Mannerism: The Crisis of the Renaissance and the Origin of Modern Art*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hauser, Arnold (1962) *Social history of art, Vol II, Renaissance, Mannerism, Baroque*, London: Routledge

Hauser, Arnold (1959) *The Philosophy of Art History*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf

- 
- Lang, Karen (2006) *Chaos and Cosmos. On the Image in Aesthetics and Art History*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lepschy, Laura (1983) *Tintoretto Observed: a documentary survey of critical reactions from the 16th to the 20th century*, Ravenna: Longo.
- Lichtenstein, Sara (1964) 'Cézanne and Delacroix', *The Art Bulletin* Vol. 46, No. 1 (Mar., 1964), pp. 55-67
- Loh, Maria (2009) 'Huomini della nostra età. Tintoretto's Preposterous Modernity', in *Jacopo Tintoretto. Proceedings of the international Symposium Jacopo Tintoretto*, ed. Miguel Falomir, Madrid: Prado Museum, pp188-196
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1993) *The Merleau-Ponty aesthetics reader : philosophy and painting*, ed. and trans. Galen A. Johnson, and Smith, Michael B. Evanston Illinois: Northwestern University Press
- Mocanu, Virgil (1977) *Tintoretto*. California: Abbey Library.
- Montaigne, Michel de (1845). *The Works of Michael de Montaigne*, trans. And with notes by W. Hazlitt. London : C. Templeman.
- Newton, Eric (1952) *Tintoretto*, London, Longmans, Green & Co.
- Nichols, Tom (2015) *Tintoretto. Tradition and Identity*. London, Reaktion.
- Osmaston, Francis.P.B (1915) *The Art and Genius of Tintoret*, 2 Vols, London: G. Bell & Sons.
- Reff, Theodore (1963), 'Cezanne's dream of Hannibal', *The Art Bulletin*, June.
- Rosand, David (1982) *Painting in Cinquecento Venice. Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Ridolfi, Carlo (1924) *Tintoretto*, ed. Detlev Von Hadeln, London: Courtauld Institute of Art
- Sartre, Jean-Paul (1963) *Essays in Aesthetics*. Trans Wade Baskin. New York, Citadel Press.
- Steer, John (1983) 'Titian and Venetian Colour', in *The Genius of Venice*, eds Jane Martineau and Charles Hope London: Royal Academy of Arts.
- Schmitt, Charles B. and Skinner, Quentin (1990), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Summers, David (1981) *Michelangelo and the language of art*, Princeton; Guildford: Princeton University Press.
- Taine, Hyppolite (1869) *Voyage to Italy*, trans. J Durand, New York

---

Van Tuinen, Sjoerd (Forthcoming 2017) 'The Cosmic Artisan: Mannerist Virtuosity and Contemporary Crafts. In Robin Van Den Akker, Alison Gibbons, Tim Vermeulen (eds0. *Metamodernism: Historicity, Affect and Depth After Postmodernism*. Lanham : Rowman & Littlefield International.

Venturi, Lionello (1978) *Cézanne*, trans. Giulio Carlo Argan, Geneva: Skira.

Wilde, Johannes (1974) *Venetian Art. From Bellini to Titian*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Wölfflin, Heinrich (1950) *Principles of Art History. The Problem of the Development of Style in later Art*, trans.

JD Hottinger, London: Dover.